

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Ishiwaki (US 5,847,518).

Claims 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishiwaki in view of Kawano et al. (US 5,736,917).

Claims 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 10 and 14. Accordingly, claims 10-17 are pending for consideration.

**All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that it is unclear whether the recitation of “a bobbin” at line 3 of claims 10 and 14 is the same as the “a bobbin” recited at line 1 of claims 10 and 14. Applicants have amended claims 10 and 14, at line 3, to recite “the bobbin.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 14 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Ishiwaki (US 5,847,518), and claims 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ishiwaki in view of Kawano et al. (US 5,736,917). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claims 10 and 14, as amended, both recite a transformer for driving a lamp of a liquid crystal display including a bobbin wound with a coil and a core introduced into the bobbin, “wherein the core includes first and second E-shaped core portions each having centers passing through a center of the bobbin and sidewall portions surrounding sides of the bobbin.” The Office Action alleges that the U-shaped cores 5 and 5’ of Ishiwaki are “first and second E-shaped core portions” as claimed. Applicants respectfully disagree. In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, the cores 5 and 5’ of Ishiwaki are U-shaped. Thus, Ishiwaki does not disclose a core that “includes first and second E-shaped core portions each having centers passing through a center of the bobbin and sidewall portions surrounding sides of the bobbin,” as recited by amended independent claims 10 and 14.

Applicants further assert that the Office Action does not rely upon Kawano et al. to teach these features. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Kawano et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies noted above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishiwaki and Kawano et al., whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest every limitation recited by independent claims 10 and 14, as amended, and hence dependent claims 11-13 and 15-17.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied art does not teach or suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 10 and 14, and hence dependent claims 11-13 and 15-17.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



\_\_\_\_\_  
David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: February 4, 2004

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000